SECOND DIVISION

[G.R. No. 136729. September 23 ,2003]

ASTRO ELECTRONICS CORP. and PETER ROXAS, petitioner, vs. PHILIPPINE EXPORT AND FOREIGN LOAN GUARANTEE CORPORATION, respondent.

DECISION

AUSTRIA-MARTINEZ, J.:

Assailed in this petition for review on *certiorari* under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court is the decision of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CV No. 41274, ^[1] affirming the decision of the Regional Trial Court (Branch 147) of Makati, then Metro Manila, whereby petitioners Peter Roxas and Astro Electronics Corp. (Astro for brevity) were ordered to pay respondent Philippine Export and Foreign Loan Guarantee Corporation (Philguarantee), jointly and severally, the amount of P3,621,187.52 with interests and costs.

The antecedent facts are undisputed.

Astro was granted several loans by the Philippine Trust Company (Philtrust) amounting to P3,000,000.00 with interest and secured by three promissory notes: PN NO. PFX-254 dated December 14, 1981 for P600,000.00, PN No. PFX-258 also dated December 14, 1981 for P400,000.00 and PN No. 15477 dated August 27, 1981 for P2,000,000.00. In each of these promissory notes, it appears that petitioner Roxas signed twice, as President of Astro and in his personal capacity. Roxas also signed a Continuing Surety ship Agreement in favor of Philtrust Bank, as President of Astro and as surety.

Thereafter, Philguarantee, with the consent of Astro, guaranteed in favor of Philtrust the payment of 70% of Astros loan, ^[4] subject to the condition that upon payment by Philguanrantee of said amount, it shall be proportionally subrogated to the rights of Philtrust against Astro. ^[5]

As a result of Astros failure to pay its loan obligations, despite demands, Philguarantee paid 70% of the guaranteed loan to Philtrust. Subsequently, Philguarantee filed against Astro and Roxas a complaint for sum of money with the RTC of Makati.

In his Answer, Roxas disclaims any liability on the instruments, alleging, *inter alia*, that he merely signed the same in blank and the phrases in his personal capacity and in his official capacity were fraudulently inserted without his knowledge. [6]

After trial, the RTC rendered its decision in favor of Philguarantee with the following dispositive portion:

WHEREFORE, in view of all the foregoing, the Court hereby renders judgment in favor or (sic) the plaintiff and against the defendants Astro Electronics Corporation and Peter T. Roxas, ordering the then (sic) to pay, jointly and severally, the plaintiff the sum of P3,621.187.52 representing the total obligation of defendants in favor of plaintiff Philguarantee as of December 31, 1984 with interest at the stipulated rate of 16% per annum and stipulated penalty charges of 16% per annum computed from January 1, 1985 until the amount is fully paid. With costs.

SO ORDERED.[7]

The trial court observed that if Roxas really intended to sign the instruments merely in his capacity as President of Astro, then he should have signed only once in the promissory note. [8]

On appeal, the Court of Appeals affirmed the RTC decision agreeing with the trial court that Roxas failed to explain satisfactorily why he had to sign twice in the contract and therefore the presumption that private transactions have been fair and regular must be sustained.

[9]

In the present petition, the principal issue to be resolved is whether or not Roxas should be jointly and severally liable (solidary) with Astro for the sum awarded by the RTC.

The answer is in the affirmative.

Astros loan with Philtrust Bank is secured by three promissory notes. These promissory notes are valid and binding against Astro and Roxas. As it appears on the notes, Roxas signed twice: first, as president of Astro and second, in his personal capacity. In signing his name aside from being the President of Asro, Roxas became a co-maker of the promissory notes and cannot escape any liability arising from it. Under the Negotiable Instruments Law, persons who write their names on the face of promissory notes are